

which was once home to dozens of thriving mill towns. Now if you drive across that district, my district, from Troy to Cohoes, to Schenectady, to Amsterdam, to Gloversville, you can see the glaring hole that the loss of industry has created. This is a story that resonates all too frequently throughout the United States, from New England to the Midwest, and now even into the South.

My hometown of Amsterdam, New York, was once home to thriving carpet mills that employed thousands of workers. Decades ago General Electric employed more than 40,000 workers in Schenectady, and American Locomotive employed 12,000-plus. But for a few thousand GE employees, manufacturing in Schenectady has disappeared. The glove-making industry once employed 80 percent of the residents of Gloversville, New York, and that industry has also almost completely disappeared.

The decline of manufacturing in Upstate New York occurred before the free trade agreements that were negotiated in the 1990s. But since those agreements have been signed, the decline of manufacturing has accelerated dramatically.

Trade policy, when done right, can benefit countries around the world. My objection, Madam Speaker, is that our current trade agreements place a disproportionate burden on American workers and leave our United States at a significant competitive disadvantage compared to the rest of the world. By negotiating trade agreements that do not have adequate labor standards or environmental provisions, we simply export pollution and poor working standards to other nations. It is indeed hard for a glove-manufacturing company based in my congressional district to compete with another manufacturer located in one of the so-called "free trade zones" in Central America, for instance, where employees make cents on the dollar, are offered no benefits, and work in factories that do not have those safety provisions so guaranteed for our American workers.

By inserting basic labor standards into our trade agreements that address worker pay, worker safety, worker benefits, and the length of that workday, American workers will be more competitive. In addition, by strengthening labor provisions in our trade agreements, we can help guarantee that better standard of living for workers in the countries with which we are trading.

Environmental standards are often another significant area that have not been sufficiently addressed by NAFTA, and this oversight is continuing under these NAFTA-like trade agreements coming before us. In the 1970s we collectively agreed that preserving the environment is essential, is necessary to our health and our way of life. The legislation that came out of that period helped to preserve our air and our water by limiting the pollutants that

companies could emit into the environment, our environment. By agreeing to free trade agreements that do not include similar provisions to protect the environment, we not only make American manufacturers less competitive, but we export our pollution to developing countries.

Again, the solution to this problem is simple: by including environmental provisions into our trade agreements, we can even the playing field for American workers and reduce the environmental impact of manufacturing in other countries.

I honestly believe that trade can help the American economy. It can help our manufacturers and can help our workers. However, this trade has got to be done right. We cannot keep agreeing to those lopsided trade agreements that leave American workers without jobs because American companies cannot compete with firms located overseas that can pay their workers sweatshop wages and operate in ways that devastate our shared, our shared, environment.

When this body is asked to consider the past administration's NAFTA-style trade agreements in the coming months, I will be forced to add my voice to the millions of American workers who have had enough: enough of exporting American jobs overseas, enough of competing with workers that pay cents on the dollar. And the American people have had enough of free trade and demand a trade model, a fair trade model, that will help our economy recover.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### RIGHT-WING EXTREMISTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, recently at a town hall meeting, Dottie from Andrews, Texas, and I won't give her last name, came to me and said that she did not attend a TEA party in the area because she was afraid that the Department of Homeland Security would have agents there taking down names and taking pictures.

Well, Madam Speaker, I rise today to reassure my constituent Dottie from Andrews that while Secretary Napolitano may be guilty of bad judgment bordering on negligence, she does not really consider her to be a domestic terrorist, nor do I believe the Secretary has unleashed the multitude of resources, assets, tools, and weapons of the Department of Homeland Security against her or me.

Dottie, like many individuals across my district and throughout the Nation, was at first surprised and then angered to learn that the Department of Homeland Security's new definition of a right-wing terrorist sounded a lot like her. To quote the recently released Homeland Security memo: "Many right-wing extremists are antagonistic toward the new Presidential administration and its perceived stance on a range of issues, including immigration and citizenship, the expansion of social programs to minorities, and restrictions on firearms ownership and use."

In a ham-handed fashion, the memo further defines the Department's view of right-wing extremists to include the great many Americans who believe that gun owners have constitutional rights protected by the second amendment, that our national values are not something to be bartered with for international agreements, that the immigration policy in our Nation is a failure, and that we are mortgaging the future to fund today's spending spree that we can never repay.

It then goes on to single out returning war veterans as individuals who warrant special government attention because they are especially susceptible to these extreme views.

If these are the positions of extremists, Madam Speaker, then I am an extremist. I am extreme in my belief that our Constitution protects law-abiding citizens from being treated like criminals. I am extreme in my belief that our Nation's sovereignty and values are not up for negotiation or debate with international thugs and 21st-century socialists. I am extreme in my belief that the Federal Government is failing the American people every day that we don't control our borders. I am extreme in my belief that we are running unsustainable deficits and selling future generations of Americans into indentured servitude in order to score political points today. And I am extreme in my belief that our veterans deserve our humble gratitude and prayers, not police scrutiny.

Secretary Napolitano's crass misunderstanding of the concerns of conservative Americans is not only embarrassing, but it detracts from her Department's ability to protect America. Her report is riddled with anecdotal evidence and pointlessly broad generalizations. It is a "well, duh" listing of long-established facts about racist organizations, anti-government militias, and other fringe radicals.

Any memo that relates the members of these fringe organizations with individuals who hold conservative political beliefs will serve only to confuse law enforcement personnel and alarm the public. Where there are public safety concerns, these should be communicated in a precise and meaningful manner; otherwise, the administration should stop antagonizing and profiling its innocent citizens.

In its rush to placate The New York Times editorial board and MoveOn.org,